<u>CLAIMS</u>

1. (Currently Amended) An interactive computer-implemented system for

specifying and executing temporal order events, comprising a processor executing:

a constraint component that receives, from a user, loose temporal constraints

associated with a plurality of events, wherein the loose temporal constraints specify

information about execution of an event comprising a start time or a stop time and event

execution relative to other events the plurality of events, and wherein the loose temporal

constraints specify relative timing information but not exact literal times that that each of

the plurality of events is to be executed;

a system information component that receives execution system information

comprising one or more of available memory, cache coherency, data throughput or

number of processors; and

an order component that determines, determines a plurality of event execution

orders in accordance with the loose temporal constraints and via utility-based analysis

of the execution system information, and selects an optimal event execution order from

the plurality of event execution orders based on the execution system information;

wherein:

each of the plurality of execution orders specifies exact literal times each

of the plurality of events is executed;

the exact literal times are consistent with the loose temporal constraints;

and

Serial No.: 10/766,431

Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson -2- lee@haves The Business of IP®

all of the plurality of execution orders do not provide the same specific

temporal constraints on the plurality of events, but all of the plurality of execution orders

are based on the loose temporal constraints.

2. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, wherein [[the]] a constraint

from among the loose temporal constraints is an event start and/or a stop time.

3. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, wherein [[the]] a constraint from

among the loose temporal constraints is event duration and/or a filter.

4. (Canceled)

5. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, further comprising a wherein

the system information component that provides information about an execution system

to the order component to facilitate selection of [[an]] the optimal event execution order.

6. (Canceled)

7. (Original) The system of claim 5, the information about an execution system

-3-

includes data throughput rate.

Serial No.: 10/766,431 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson

lee@hayes The Business of IP®

8. (Currently Amended) An interactive computer-implemented system for

specifying and executing temporal order events, comprising a processor executing:

a display component that provides a plurality of object workspaces, wherein the

workspaces are user interfaces including a past, present and future space, wherein the

present space is an editable area, and wherein the past and future space specify

temporal constraints associated with a plurality of events; [[and]]

a design component that temporally associates and disassociate objects in the

editable area, wherein the design component receives, from a user, loose temporal

constraints governing event execution orders; and area generating a plurality of event

execution orders and determines an optimal execution order of events from the plurality

of event execution orders based at least in part on the object associations specifying

temporal constraints wherein non-associated objects order of execution is determined,

via utility-based analysis of an executing system information comprising available

memory, cache coherency, data throughput and number of processors.

an order component that determines a plurality of event execution orders,

wherein:

each of the plurality of execution orders provides a sequence by which the

plurality of events could be executed in accordance with the loose temporal constraints;

each of the plurality of execution orders specifies exact literal times each

of the plurality of events is executed;

the exact literal times are consistent with the loose temporal constraints;

all of the plurality of execution orders do not provide the same specific

temporal constraints on the plurality of events; and

Serial No.: 10/766,431 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US

Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson

-4- lee@haves The Business of IP®

the order component selects an optimal event execution order from the

plurality of event execution orders in accordance with execution system information.

**9.** (Previously Presented) The system of claim 8, object workspaces that

facilitate a graphical-based approach to specify relationships amongst objects.

10. (Canceled)

11. (Original) The system of claim 8, non-associated objects are executed

randomly.

12. (Original) The system of claim 8, the design component comprising a

specification component that receives hard start and/or end times for events associated

with objects.

**13.** (Original) The system of claim 8, the design component temporally

associates objects as a function of respective location in the editable area.

**14.** (Original) The system of claim 8, further comprising a duration component

that receives information regarding event duration.

**15.** (Original) The system of claim 8, the design component receives and

executes information related to nested events associated with respective objects.

Serial No.: 10/766,431 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US

Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson

-5- lee@haves The Business of IP®

**16.** (Original) The system of claim 8, further comprising a policy component that

applies predefined rules to execution of the objects.

**17. (Original)** The system of claim 8, further comprising a policy component that

applies predefined rules to editing of the objects.

**18.** (Original) The system of claim 8, the design component receives and

executes information regarding hierarchical relationship of respective objects.

19. (Original) The system of claim 8, the design component receives and

executes information regarding dependency relationship of respective objects.

20. (Original) The system of claim 8, further comprising a query component that

searches for events that satisfy a query, and displays objects associated with the events

in temporal order.

**21.** (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, the guery component

provides context information for respective objects.

22. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 8, objects placed in the past

area are executed prior to objects in the present area and objects placed in the future

area are executed after objects in the present area.

23. (Canceled)

Serial No.: 10/766,431 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US

Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson

-6- lee@hayes The Business of IP®

**24.** (Original) The system of claim 8, the design component associates objects

in a non-linear conditional manner.

25. (Original) The system of claim 8, the design component associates objects

via iterative loops.

**26.** (Original) The system of claim 8, the design component associates objects

based on a specified version.

27. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method for specifying and

executing temporal order events comprising the following computer executable

instructions stored on a tangible computer readable medium:

receiving, from a user, loose temporal constraints associated with a plurality of

events, wherein the loose temporal constraints specifying specify information about

execution of the plurality of events, and wherein the loose temporal constraints do not

specify exact literal times that that each of the plurality of events is to be executed;

receiving execution system information comprising one or more of available

memory, cache coherency, data throughput or number of processors;

generating a plurality of execution orders for the plurality of events in accordance

with the <u>loose temporal</u> constraints, <u>wherein</u>:

each of the plurality of execution orders specifies exact literal times each

of the plurality of events is executed;

Serial No.: 10/766,431

Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson -7- lee@hayes The Business of IP®

the exact literal times are consistent with the loose temporal constraints;

<u>and</u>

all of the plurality of execution orders do not provide the same specific

temporal constraints on the plurality of events, but all of the plurality of execution orders

are based on the loose temporal constraints and on the execution system information;

selecting an optimal event order based in part on the system execution

information;

receiving execution system information comprising one or more of available

memory, cache coherency, data throughput or number of processors; and

outputting [[an]] the optimal event execution order selected from the plurality of

execution orders based at least in part on execution system information.

28. (Canceled)

29. (Currently Amended) A method, comprising: for object authoring

implemented on a computer comprising the following computer executable instructions

stored on a tangible computer readable medium:

storing, in a memory communicatively coupled to a processor, computer-

executable instructions for performing the method, wherein the method orders events to

be executed by an execution system;

executing the instructions on the processor;

according to the instructions being executed:

receiving object data associated with events from a workspace including at least

one of a past, present, or future area;

Serial No.: 10/766,431

Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson -8- lee@haves The Business of IP®

associating objects temporally based at least in part upon relative object

locations;

generating a plurality of execution orders based at least on the temporal

association of the objects;

wherein the received object data is from a user, and comprises loose temporal

constraints associated with a plurality of events, wherein the loose temporal constraints

specify information about execution of the plurality of events, and wherein the loose

temporal constraints do not specify exact literal times that that each of the plurality of

events is to be executed;

receiving execution system information comprising one or more of available

memory, cache coherency, data throughput or number of processors;

generating a plurality of execution orders for the plurality of events in accordance

with the constraints, wherein:

each of the plurality of execution orders specifies exact literal times each

of the plurality of events is executed;

the exact literal times are consistent with the loose temporal constraints;

and

all of the plurality of execution orders do not provide the same specific

temporal constraints on the plurality of events, but all of the plurality of execution orders

are based on the loose temporal constraints;

selecting an execution order of events from the plurality of event execution

orders based at least on information comprising available memory, cache coherency,

data throughput and number of processors.

Serial No.: 10/766,431 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US

Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson

-9-

lee@hayes The Business of IP®

30. (Original) The method of claim 29, further comprising associating objects

based on one or more operational objects.

31. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 30, wherein the operational

objects correspond to at least a loop, a trigger, a conditional and hard start and/or stop

times.

32-34. (Canceled)

35. (Original) The method of claim 29, wherein objects are associated in a non-

linear conditional manner.

**36.** (Original) The method of claim 29, wherein the objects are associated via

iterative loops.

37-38. (Canceled)

**39.** (Previously Presented) The system of claim 8, wherein information about

event start and stop times and event duration is communicated with a particular object.

40. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 39, wherein the objects are

bars and fuzzy edges on the bars indicate an unspecified time.

Serial No.: 10/766,431 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson

lee@hayes The Business of IP®

-10-

41. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 40, wherein the fuzzy edges on

at beginning of the bar indicate an unspecified start time and the fuzzy logic on at end of

the bar indicates an unspecified end time and/or duration.

**42.** (Previously Presented) The system of claim 40, wherein hard bold edges on

the bar specifies specific start and/or stop time.

43. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 1, wherein the execution

system information comprises at least available memory, cache coherency, data

throughput and number of processors of the system.

44. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 8, wherein the temporal

constraints comprising one specific event must finish before another specific event

starts.

45. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 8, wherein the past and future

space provide a context for navigation to a user during application development.

Serial No.: 10/766,431 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -4243US Atty/Agent: David S. Thompson

lee@hayes The Business of IP®

-11-